25X1

25X1A

OGC HAS REVIEWED.

25X1A	
25X1A	

the advance of funds discussed with and sufficient funds by him to people who had arrived in to take care of themselves. It is decided that there are three steps that Administration can take to overcoming this difficulty:

Extending the operations of the Credit Union to overseas areas.

25X1A

- b. Establishing a fund for such cases.
- c. Proper briefing in the U. S. before people depart for oversess stations.

25X1A felt that proper briefing at home was the most important of these and that no one should be sent overseas until it had been fully and finally determined at home that he was in such financial shape as also stated that it was probable to be able to go overseas. 25X1A was advancing funds without proper legal authority that and that if security and operational necessity required that he advance these funds, the rules at home should be changed and regulations adjusted to make such advances legal.

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CSECO 37-00384R000100120021-7

25X1A

25X1

stated that at times they received directions from Washington which, in their judgement, were contrary to Agency regulations and Agency policy. They, of course, questioned such directions and then followed the directions they received. They asked where the responsibility fell if the direction was contrary to regulations

- a. in the event they had questioned the directions,
- b, in the event they were aware that the directions were contrary to regulations but had not questioned them,
- c. in the event they "thought" the directions were contrary to regulations but had not questioned them, and
- d. in the event they neither were aware, "thought", nor had questioned that the directions were contradictory to regulations.

submitted the following example:

25X1A

"We have received a Travel Order from Headquarters directing to the States on home leave, TDY at Washington,

25X1A This Travel Order authorises her to return her household goods, personal effects, and automobile at

Government expense.

"This appears to be contrary to the law as it is felt that a

person is not entitled to return his automobile at Government expense when he goes back principally for home leave. However, there is no doubt but what the Travel Order specifically authorises it and we have been advised time and time again that Travel Orders must repeat must be strictly adhered to. The question therefore arises who will be held responsible for the expenses of returning her car-if this order is found, years later, by the auditors to be contrary to either law or our regulations the authorizing official signing the document. In view of Headquarters repeated warnings that Travel Orders must be respected. to be followed exactly as written, we feel it would be unfair to

penalize the person who did so, particularly as he can not be aware

25X1A

Approved For Release 2003/11/04ECNERDP57-00384R000100120021-7

of all the ramifications of travel regulations."